

Accordingly, the proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esquire, Winston & Strawn, 1400 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005-3502.

NRC Section Chief: Richard J. Laufer.

Nuclear Management Company, LLC, Docket No. 50-305, Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant, Kewaunee County, Wisconsin

Date of amendment request: December 19, 2002.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment would revise the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant (KNPP) Technical Specifications (TS) reporting requirements for the discovery of defective or degraded steam generator tubes.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes do not have any effect on structures, systems, and components (SSCs) of the Kewaunee Nuclear Power Plant. The changes do not affect plant operations, any design function or an analysis that verifies the capability of an SSC to perform a design function. The changes do not change any previously evaluated accidents in the updated safety analysis report (UFSAR). As these changes are administrative, there is no increase in the probability and consequences of analyzed accidents.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

Response: No.

The proposed changes are administrative and do not change the design function or operation of any plant SSCs. The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident due to credible new failure mechanisms, malfunctions, or accident initiators not considered in the design and licensing bases.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety?

Response: No.

The proposed changes modify NRC reporting requirements only. The changes do not exceed or alter a design basis or safety limit or significantly reduce the margin of safety.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: John H. O'Neill, Jr., Esq., Shaw Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge, 2300 N. Street, NW, Washington, DC 20037-1128.

NRC Section Chief: L. Raghavan.

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc., Georgia Power Company, Oglethorpe Power Corporation, Municipal Electric Authority of Georgia, City of Dalton, Georgia, Docket No. 50-366, Edwin I. Hatch Nuclear Plant, Unit 2, Appling County, Georgia

Date of amendment request: December 4, 2002.

Description of amendment request: The proposed amendment changes the Hatch Unit 2 turbine building high temperature primary containment isolation value specified in Technical Specification Table 3.3.6.1-1, Item 1f.

Basis for proposed no significant hazards consideration determination: As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. [Does] the [* * *] proposed [* * *] change involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated[?]

This TS [Technical Specification] revision request changes the allowable value for the turbine building high temperature primary containment isolation. The setpoint at which the isolation occurs has nothing to do with preventing a system break; therefore, this proposed change will not change the probability of occurrence of a small primary coolant system break.

For the turbine building high temperature primary containment isolation, the analytical limit has been calculated at 207°F with the allowable value at 200°F. The calculation supporting these values accounts for instrument uncertainties thus confirming that

adequate margin exists between the allowable value and the analytical limit. Accordingly, the consequences of a small primary system break are not significantly increased.

2. [Does] the [* * *] proposed [* * *] change create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any previously evaluated[?]

Changing an allowable value does not introduce any new operating modes for any plant system or piece of equipment. All plant systems will continue to be operated, tested and maintained as before, and within their licensing and design basis. As a result, no new failure modes are introduced and the possibility of a new or different type of accident is not created.

3. [Does] the [* * *] proposed [* * *] change involve a significant decrease in the margin of safety[?]

Increasing the allowable value by 6°F does not result in a significant reduction in a margin of safety. A formal calculation was performed which justified an analytical limit of 207°F. This calculation determined the analytical limit based on a primary leak into the turbine building and confirmed that the allowable value adequately protects the analytical limit. As a result, the margin of safety is not significantly reduced.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration.

Attorney for licensee: Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Esquire, Shaw, Pittman, Potts and Trowbridge, 2300 N Street, NW., Washington, DC 20037.

NRC Section Chief: John A. Nakoski.

Notice of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses

During the period since publication of the last biweekly notice, the Commission has issued the following amendments. The Commission has determined for each of these amendments that the application complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for A Hearing in connection with these actions was published in the **Federal Register** as indicated.

Unless otherwise indicated, the Commission has determined that these